

The Kellogg Schism

THE HIDDEN ISSUES

RICHARD W. SCHWARZ

During the controversy over the concepts expressed in John Harvey Kellogg's book *The Living Temple*, Ellen White received a vivid representation of a ship about to collide with an iceberg.¹ "An authoritative voice cried out, 'Meet it!' " There was no doubt in her mind as to the significance of this command. She was to speak out boldly and at once "regarding the errors that were coming in among us."

I have frequently marveled at the aptness of the iceberg representation. Among the first things one learns about icebergs is that the greatest portion of the berg is hidden beneath water; the visible portion is usually only a small fraction of the whole. Why did God choose to represent the Kellogg "problem" as an iceberg? Quite likely because only a small part of the danger of Kellogg's theological ideas, which Ellen White labeled "akin to pantheism," was clearly visible to most contemporary observers.

A secondary interpretation of the iceberg representation suggests itself. Through the years since 1902 pantheism has been widely publicized as the reason for Kellogg's expulsion from the church in 1907. This has been the "visible" part of the iceberg, the part that could be clearly pointed out. Many other differences have lain obscured beneath the surface. Nevertheless, they were there, and they formed a significant part of the complex circumstances that led to Kellogg's being separated from the church to whose program of medical work he had contributed more than a quarter-century of strenuous endeavor.

One of the primary things to be kept in mind is that Kellogg's differences with church leaders did not begin in 1902. He was almost continually embroiled in controversy with one or another church leader after he became superintendent of the Western Health Reform Institute in 1876. Even his chief backer, James White, found himself out of step with his youthful protégé, and Kellogg subsequently joined forces with George I. Butler and Stephen N. Haskell in a successful effort to relieve Elder White of leadership responsibilities.

The causes for these numerous controversies were many and varied. Of central importance, however, was Kellogg's observation that there was a wide and uncalled-for difference between Adventist teaching and practice in healthful living — particularly when it came to the renunciation of flesh foods in the diet. For instance, although Ellen White had begun to advocate vegetarian diet in 1864, it was not until thirty years later that she felt able to banish meat completely from her household. She herself had continued to eat flesh foods, occasionally at least, as late as 1891.² This undoubtedly encouraged a number of Adventist ministers to slight many of the health reform doctrines, and Kellogg believed these men purposely undercut the vigorous efforts he was making to get Adventists to discard tea, coffee, and meat. He was particularly irked to find conference leaders asking for chicken or steak when eating at the sanitarium during attendance at General Conference sessions.³

Adventist history is replete with individuals who fasten onto a particular aspect of doctrine and seek to make all else subservient to it. Ellen White found it frequently necessary to warn Kellogg against thinking that the health teachings and medical work were all-important and censoring those who did not agree with him.⁴ An example of the central position Kellogg attached to healthful living can be seen in his statement to Ellen White that it seemed

very clear . . . that those who meet the Lord when he comes will be above the power of disease as well as above the power of sin and that they will reach this condition by obedience to the truth [health reform]. . . . It seems to me very clear . . . that the sealing of God is a physical and moral change which takes place in the man as the result of truth and which shows in his very countenance that it is the seal of God, and that the mark of the beast is the mark of the work of the beast in the heart and it changes the body as well as the character and also shows in the countenance. It seems to me our people have been wrong in regarding Sunday observance as the sole mark of the beast. . . . The mark of the beast . . . is simply the change of character and body which comes from the surrender of the will to Satan.⁵

Thus Kellogg appears to have considered the practice of health reform doctrines to be intimately bound up with spiritual growth and perfection.

With such a viewpoint it was easy to hurl condemnation at "the General Conference Committee and a few of the leading men," who, Kellogg maintained, "have been against our work for the greater part of the time during the last eighteen years, and the ministers have been educated against us and to believe that they were the divinely appointed leaders of the people, and when they have seen the people following truths which they have not preached, the disposition has been to belittle these principles and truths, and to direct the people's attention away from them."⁶ This complaint about the adverse leadership of the ministry in matters of healthful living was nothing new. Kellogg had written a quarter of a century earlier that a backsliding from health reform practices had taken place among Adventists because "the ministers discourage the people by their example."⁷

Unfortunately, Kellogg's criticism of the ministry did not stop with his justified concern over their incomplete conversion to health reform. He became critical of what he considered to be their misuse of funds: they appropriated too much money for personal travel and were too niggardly in support of medical missionary endeavors. Preachers, the doctor complained, got "in the habit of managing everything" and were "determined to do so."⁸ He could sarcastically remark that many Adventist ministers preached "only for a living" and were able to earn more in this way than their talents would allow them to bring in through some other livelihood.⁹

During the 1880s and early 1890s, Kellogg wangled invitations to many camp meetings, where he promoted healthful living and tried to enlist talented young people as health evangelists or "medical missionaries." He traveled to these meetings at his own expense, and was frustrated when he was assigned only the early morning (five o'clock) service; saw tea, coffee, and canned salmon on sale at the provision tents; and had prospective medical missionaries persuaded to devote their time and efforts to bookselling instead.¹⁰

Canvassing was a particularly touchy area as far as Kellogg was concerned. In the 1880s he began publishing his own books and hiring his own subscription agents because he was dissatisfied both with the financial arrangements offered him by the Review and Herald Publishing Association after James White's death and because he was convinced that his health books were not being pushed as vigorously as they should be. "The love of money seems as strong an incentive with our canvassers as the love of truth," he grumbled, "and it seems to me a little more so."¹¹

Later he criticized Review and Herald managers because he considered the wages they paid too high. The scale made it difficult for him to get satisfactory help at the sanitarium at what he considered "reasonable" rates. Although personally very generous in aiding any individuals in need, Kellogg was never able to take a very liberal attitude toward wages for sanitarium employees. Anything that put pressure on him in this area was certain to be regarded with suspicion.¹²

Both finances and pride were undoubtedly involved when Kellogg's cereal and protein creations failed to receive the reception he felt they deserved in church circles. He accused some church leaders of defaming the products until it became apparent that these might be financially successful — at which time he observed "a most greedy disposition . . . on the part of the ministers . . . to take possession of our Food Business and utilize it for building up Conference enterprises."¹³

In Kellogg's day most Adventist ministers lacked the advantage of much formal education beyond grammar school. This lack contributed to the doctor's feeling of superiority toward his ministerial colleagues. He considered many of these men ungrateful because of their opposition to his projects and teachings, even though he had "had occasion more than once to shield and protect at my own personal expense, ministers who had been guilty of the deepest sins, even crimes against God and men."¹⁴

Although available evidence makes it difficult to evaluate all of Kellogg's complaints against Adventist preachers, it seems reasonable to suspect that some were justified, at least in part. Significantly, as he became embittered against the ministry, he disparaged them "in every way that he could" and adopted toward them an "autocratic, arrogant and haughty" manner. Not surprisingly this "bred ill feeling," and many of the clergy became more than ever prone to question and condemn any Kellogg project or teaching.¹⁵

II

In the decade that preceded his final separation from the church, a number of specific policy disagreements intensified Kellogg's distrust of church leaders. Particularly vexing to the doctor was a growing suspicion that ministerial leaders were determined to dictate policy and practices to be followed in medical institutions. He was dubious about the ability of the Foreign Mission Board to select, train, and place medical missionaries. These activities, he maintained, should instead be carried out by the Medical Missionary Board which he headed. "It seems incomprehensible," Kellogg wrote, "that men should get so exalted in their own estimation as to form

conceptions that a preacher is so much superior to a doctor or a doctor so much inferior to a preacher, that the doctor, or even a company of Christian doctors, would not be capable of directing their own work, in which they have been trained for years, while the preacher, who has had no experience in the work whatsoever, becomes, by virtue of his ministerial license, competent to direct the physician or the nurse."¹⁶

In the early 1890s Kellogg began to lay plans to assure his continued undisputed control of the Battle Creek Sanitarium. He professed to believe that during these years there was a persistent "effort on the part of W. C. White and others to get the Sanitarium under control of the General Conference. It required constant vigilance to baffle the various plots and schemes that were set in motion."¹⁷

27 The need to secure a new way to continue the legal life of the sanitarium after the expiration of its original charter in 1897 provided the doctor with an opportunity to solidify his position. He devised a plan for organizing a new Michigan Sanitarium and Benevolent Association that was to purchase the sanitarium from the original stockholders through merely assuming the institution's outstanding debts. This plan was accomplished without major difficulties on July 1, 1898. Kellogg himself composed the governing articles of the new MSBA.¹⁸ Although old stockholders were allowed to become members of the new association and also to nominate an additional member for each share of stock held in the original Health Reform Institute, each MSBA member had to sign a "declaration of principles."

In this declaration they agreed that the association was to be a nonprofit institution and that work at the sanitarium was to be carried on in "an undenominational, unsectarian, humanitarian and philanthropic" way. Although members had also to declare a belief in God, the Bible, and the principles of Christianity, there was no provision that they be Seventh-day Adventists. The association articles also provided that voting at business meetings had to be done by members *in person*. At any meeting to elect trustees it was possible for the association members who were present to suspend or drop from membership any member who was considered to be out of harmony with the principles upheld at the sanitarium.¹⁹ Kellogg utilized these last two provisions to expel many Adventist leaders from the MSBA after his own expulsion from the church.²⁰

At the time of the sanitarium reorganization, some church leaders had expressed concern over the projected labeling of the sanitarium as "undenominational" and "unsectarian." Kellogg assured them that this wording was necessary in order for the sanitarium to "have the advantages of the

statutes of the State; as a hospital, it must be carried on as an undenominational institution. It can not give benefits to a certain class, but must be for the benefit of any who are sick. The institution may support any work it chooses with the earnings of the Association, but cannot discriminate against any one because of his beliefs."²¹ Satisfied by the explanation, the questioners withdrew their opposition to this wording.

It soon developed, however, that Kellogg's explanation about the ease with which the earnings of the association could be dispersed was inaccurate. The statute under which charitable institutions were chartered prohibited them from sending any earnings outside the state of Michigan. Some church leaders expressed the idea that Kellogg had deliberately plotted to take advantage of this provision so that he might build up his interests in Battle Creek, a charge which he hotly denied.²²

Certain statements Kellogg had begun to make were undoubtedly partially responsible for the increasing suspicion expressed as to his actions during the rechartering of the sanitarium. At the start of 1903 he stated to a newspaper reporter that the sanitarium had "no connection with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination as such" and that "membership in the Association governing it is as open to a Catholic as to a Seventh-day Adventist."²³ This certainly appeared to be out of harmony with a statement Ellen White had made more than twenty years earlier. "It was the purpose of God," she wrote, "that a health institution should be organized and controlled exclusively by S. D. Adventists."²⁴

Under no circumstances was Kellogg willing to see the sanitarium pass under direct church ownership or control. He vigorously opposed a resolution (considered at the 1903 General Conference session) that recommended that all institutions being operated by the church be placed under direct church ownership. Even before the resolution was passed he announced: "I expect you will pass it; but I want you to know that I object to it and do not expect to be bound by it in anything I have anything to do with."²⁵

III

During the five years preceding 1907, relations between Kellogg and top church administrators — particularly Arthur G. Daniells, William W. Prescott, William C. White, and Irwin H. Evans — deteriorated rapidly. Kellogg had been at perhaps the height of his power within the church in 1901. By that year employees under the direct supervision of the Kellogg-controlled International Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association totaled about 2,000. This was approximately 500 more than were employed

by the General Conference Association.²⁶ The doctor had also persuaded the General Conference president, George A. Irwin, to agree to a larger than usual representation for the church's medical institutions at the 1901 General Conference. At this gathering, Kellogg was elected a member of both the twenty-five-member General Conference executive committee and the Board of Foreign Missions. In addition he retained his position as head of the IMMBA.²⁷ This same General Conference abolished the office of president and gave chief authority between conference sessions to an executive committee. Daniells was elected chairman and Prescott vice-chairman of this committee.

At first Kellogg's relations with Daniells appeared to be on a better basis than with almost any top Adventist leader since James White. By the early fall of 1902, however, he was writing about Daniells, "I think he is running his course pretty fast. I am sorry for he has so many excellent traits and qualifications for his position; but when a man puts on a king's cap, he has got a pretty hard row to hoe."²⁸ Several weeks later the doctor commented that Daniells, who was now signing documents as General Conference president in spite of the 1901 reorganization, was "a very determined man and has made up his mind that he is going to run things according to his idea, the ideas of other men do not seem to be of much account to him."²⁹ By mid-December Kellogg had decided that there was "a more pronounced and ruling spirit than I ever saw before, and more concentration of power, and an eager attempt to gather in more. 'We will help you if you will obey us' is the edict which has gone forth, 'We will obey God and trust Him to help us' is our reply."³⁰ Shortly before this, at the Fall Council of Adventist leaders, some of Kellogg's supporters on the General Conference executive committee had attempted to replace Daniells with Alonzo T. Jones as the committee chairman. Although this attempt failed, it was regarded by many as a clear signal that Kellogg had abandoned hope of working in harmony with Daniells.³¹

What caused the break between Kellogg and Daniells? The doctor traced it to the fall of 1901 when he claimed that "Prescott and Daniells formed a plot to oust [Edward A.] Sutherland [then president of Emmanuel Missionary College] and put Prescott into the Berrien Springs school. I discovered the thing and took such a strong stand against it that I broke it up. They have been after me ever since, and Prof. Prescott's objection to the book [*The Living Temple*] was an after thought."³² Be this as it may, relations between Daniells and Kellogg appeared cordial until after a trip to Europe in the summer of 1902 which both men took with a number of other

church leaders. Several events appear to have taken place in the course of this trip and openly to have soured relations between the two.

Close association during this trip convinced Kellogg that his clerical associates were not practicing vegetarians — something he felt to be inexcusable. He subsequently raised this point at a meeting of the General Conference executive committee. Daniells did not at that time deny that he had eaten flesh foods, although he later claimed that he had not, but refrained from saying so in order not to appear better than his brethren. While generally preaching vegetarianism, Daniells did not believe in being what he considered “fanatical” on the subject.³³ Throughout the rest of Daniells’ life Kellogg pointed him out to associates as a “meat-eater.” When he heard of Daniells’ death in 1935 he implied to friends that death had been by cancer, and that this was related to Daniells’ refusal to follow a vegetarian diet.³⁴

30

Of perhaps more immediate importance was Daniells’ refusal to give blanket approval for purchase of a sanitarium site in England until after the money became available. At a later date Kellogg vividly recalled this experience:

Daniells straightened himself up against the wall and looked down upon me in a most imperial and kingly way while I stood before him pleading with the tears running down my face, as I never plead with any man in my life; to be reasonable and not to take the position which would compel our medical men to act independent of him. I showed no resentment and no haughtiness, but plead with him as one brother would plead with another, not to take such a belligerent attitude. His committee had declared that it was a sin to be in debt . . . and announced that this was their financial policy; took a stand against the opening of the Sanitarium in England and then came home and stated to Sr. White that my position was exactly the very opposite to what it was.³⁵

At the time that he assumed leadership of the General Conference, Daniells found the church organization and most of its subsidiary institutions struggling under a heavy load of debt. Following counsel from Ellen White, he decided to retire these debts as quickly as possible and keep all future expansion on a cash basis. Kellogg did not share Daniells’ fear of debt. Although he disliked it, his own experience led him to believe that it was frequently necessary and should never stand in the way of an opportunity to expand medical missionary work. After all, he wrote, “I have paid more debts with the work of my own hands than any other man in the denomination.”³⁶ Kellogg considered Daniells’ cash policy “impractical and unreasonable.” “He proposes to force it upon everybody and denounces everything which does not agree with it,” the doctor wrote. “This is where he is making a mistake.”³⁷

Daniells later related to friends that during the 1902 European trip he had learned that Kellogg was not the firm believer in Ellen White's divinely appointed mission that he claimed to be. Daniells related that when on one occasion he had spoken to the doctor about one of Mrs. White's testimonies, Kellogg had replied, "Pooh. Do you know where she got that testimony? I gave it to her and she gave it out as coming from the Lord."³⁸

Daniells apparently also decided that it was necessary to limit Kellogg's tendency to push and dominate a situation. He told a meeting of the General Conference Committee at which Kellogg was present that the doctor had "an imperious will" that had to be broken. Kellogg found it hard to forget this remark.³⁹ Such an occurrence made it easy for Kellogg to believe a statement he claimed to have heard from Evans "that Daniells, Prescott and White had formed a compact to break me down and destroy my influence, and he knew it and could prove it. He told Magan he had letters that would prove it."⁴⁰ At other times, however, Kellogg could refer to Evans as "a schemer" and opine that "most of the difficulties we have been passing through have been due to the influence he had with Elder Daniells and Prof. Prescott."⁴¹

In the later stages of the controversy Daniells insisted that persons stand up and be counted for or against Kellogg. In 1906, for instance, shortly after Dr. William S. Sadler received his degree from American Medical Missionary College, Daniells asked him to make a public denunciation in the Battle Creek Tabernacle of Kellogg's heresies. When Sadler refused, he was told that he could consider his church service at an end (at that time he was a licensed minister as well as a physician).⁴² Another Kellogg intimate, Percy T. Magan, later expressed the view that he had been driven into virtual exile for a dozen years because he was critical of the way Daniells had treated Kellogg.⁴³

IV

Several other issues further inflamed the differences developing between the church's ministerial and medical leaders. After the disastrous fires at the sanitarium and the publishing house, attention finally began to be paid to Ellen White's counsel to scatter out from Battle Creek. Kellogg saw in this an effort to scare away the helpers on whom he depended to keep the sanitarium going. Kellogg complained to W. C. White:

Prof. Prescott seems to have lost his head completely. He has read in public extracts of things your mother has written, and the interpretation he has put on them has created on the part of certain ones a spirit of terror and consternation, and on the part of others a spirit of bitterness and rebellion, and has set the local newspapers, and more

or less the leading newspapers of the country, to deriding us. I see nothing to be gained by this kind of tactics or by making a laughing stock of ourselves. Prof. Prescott's view seems to be that the time has come for Seventh-day Adventists to leave Battle Creek; that those who do not go are likely to be destroyed if they stay, or be burned up or destroyed by an earthquake or some other horrible catastrophe.⁴⁴

Early in 1903 Kellogg advised leading Adventist educators that the increasing standards being established by the states for admission to medical school made it advisable to have a high school or college-type institution in Battle Creek where AMMC students could make up deficiencies. He proposed that the old charter of Battle Creek College be reactivated to establish an examining faculty which would utilize AMMC and sanitarium personnel. Through this reestablished college, legally acceptable grades, diplomas, and degrees could be issued. Kellogg stressed that he did not want to compete with Emmanuel Missionary College, but simply to meet a need of students already in Battle Creek.⁴⁵ But the proposal elicited a strong negative reaction from church leaders, who interpreted it as being counter to Ellen White's counsel and tantamount to nullifying the decision of the 1901 General Conference to relocate Battle Creek College in Berrien Springs.⁴⁶

By this time church leaders were becoming convinced that Kellogg's attitude toward Ellen White and her counsels had changed radically; that he no longer considered her divinely led, but was endeavoring to impugn some of her "testimonies." "The assertion is being heralded everywhere," Kellogg wrote at the start of 1906, "that I have taken a stand against the Testimonies and against Sister White, that I was trying to undermine faith in the Testimonies. That certainly is not true."⁴⁷ Yet a careful study of available Kellogg letters would seem to indicate that a change had taken place. "In recent letters sent," Kellogg wrote Ellen White in 1899, "there are many things very incomprehensible and which indicate very clearly that most incorrect representations have been made to you." Here we find the first implication that Ellen White was writing incorrectly because of misinformation. "Duplicate copies," Kellogg went on, "have been sent to various ones who are busily circulating them and the taunt is heard on every hand, 'I told you so.' 'I've been expecting this,' 'Just what I knew was true,' etc. I have been accused of being a plotter and a schemer and a selfish, covetous, ambitious wire puller."⁴⁸ The doctor was deeply wounded by this use of confidential materials which pointed out some of his weaknesses, so much so that he felt there was no alternative but "to disconnect from the work as quickly as possible."⁴⁹ Although he did not carry out this resolve, it seems that he had turned a corner in his attitude toward Ellen White.

In the decade after 1895, Kellogg received many pointed letters from Ellen White indicating where changes in his attitudes and activities needed to be made. A quick survey of the main points covered may clarify the picture. On July 15, 1895, he was advised against continually investing more money in the work at Battle Creek, which, Ellen White indicated, was already too overgrown.⁵⁰ In 1898 he was reproved for not sharing with other fields (particularly Australia) more of the gifts and loans tendered the sanitarium.⁵¹ The following year he was told that he spent too much time, strength, and money on the wrong enterprises, on perfecting "invention after invention."⁵² Ellen White also reacted to the implication that she wrote on the basis of misinformation. This, she indicated, was the tactic always used by those who did not want their own plans to be interfered with. Kellogg was inclined to read those portions of her messages which sustained him, she commented, while neglecting her warnings and cautions.⁵³ Two months later she expressed the opinion that God had not given Kellogg the job of carrying out the extensive social uplift programs he had begun in Chicago, and money was being misused in these activities.⁵⁴

These reproofs were followed in March 1900 by a pointed criticism of Seventh-day Adventists establishing undenominational institutions. Ellen White then went on to warn Kellogg that he was disregarding the distinctive Adventist message, wrongly engaging in criticism of the ministry, and attempting to make medical missionary work all-important.⁵⁵ Next came a reproof for threatening to separate the work he was directing from the church. But it was better for him to do this, she stated flatly, than for him to be allowed to dictate his way in everything. Kellogg was no longer a safe teacher, she said, but a man in need of conversion.⁵⁶ On several occasions during 1901, Kellogg was warned not to try to bind sanitariums, health food companies, and medical workers all under his direct control, for such actions would place too much power in human hands, leading to oppressive actions which would be very harmful.⁵⁷

Of all Ellen White's reproofs, however, Kellogg's correspondence would seem to indicate that two matters she raised particularly rankled in his mind; on these two points he repeatedly advanced the argument that she wrote on the basis of misinformation, and hence inaccurately. The first of these items dealt with her account of a vision in which she had been shown a large and expensive building used in connection with the Chicago Mission. God did not want Adventist funds to be used to erect such a building, she wrote.⁵⁸ No such building existed at this time, although during Kellogg's absence in Europe one of his associates, Dr. Alfred B. Olsen, had

drawn up plans for a large building to be used in Chicago by the American Medical Missionary College. When Kellogg returned he vetoed this plan, perhaps because of what Ellen White had written, although he later claimed:

I did not stop the erection of a building in Chicago because of the Testimony. It never occurred to me that the Testimony about buildings to harbor the unworthy poor had any reference whatever to a building for a Medical College. I only spoke against the erection of a medical college because we had no money to do it with, except by taking it from the Sanitarium, and that we could not do, because our charter forbids it.⁵⁹

34 Mrs. White later explained to Kellogg that her vision about the large building in Chicago had been given in the way that it was so as to prevent its construction. With his knowledge of the entire situation, she felt he should have discerned this.⁶⁰ Although he did not contradict this statement at the time, he later hinted that he did not see how he could be expected to understand this when Ellen White had not understood it herself. He called attention to the fact that at the 1901 General Conference, after considerable debate "in Sister White's presence," a motion was passed at William C. White's suggestion, to raise \$100,000 to erect a medical college building in Chicago. "No hint was given that any one had been shown that it was wrong to put up a building in Chicago for the medical school."⁶¹

Kellogg also clearly thought that Ellen White had not dealt rightly with him in the matter of the rebuilding of the sanitarium in Battle Creek following the disastrous fire in 1902. Nearly a dozen years before this fire Ellen White had written, "I sincerely wish that the Sanitarium were miles away from Battle Creek. From the light given me of God, I know this would be better for its spirituality and usefulness."⁶² She had subsequently written many letters to Kellogg counseling against the continual enlargement of the work in Battle Creek and holding up the desirability of scattering it in various locations.⁶³ She did not offer any counsel, however, directly after the fire itself, nor did Kellogg write for her advice. Instead he called together the top church leaders, and after long discussions it was decided to rebuild in Battle Creek. Daniells, Spicer, Cottrell, and most of the others concurred. The only objectors were Magan and Sutherland.⁶⁴

Finally, nearly six months after the fire, Ellen White wrote to Kellogg. The Lord had permitted the sanitarium to burn, she indicated, not so that a larger one could be built in its place, but so that many smaller ones, scattered throughout the country, could replace it. She later publicly stated that "when the Sanitarium . . . was burned, our people should have studied the messages of reproof and warning sent them in former years and taken

heed."⁶⁵ Several years later, material was circulated in Battle Creek by some church leaders which indicated that two days after the sanitarium fire, Ellen White had been shown that the institution should not be rebuilt in Battle Creek. Kellogg was furious. "If the Lord showed this to Sister White two days after our fire," he wrote, "what excuse can be offered for the withholding of this information for four months and until we had reached the fourth story? The *Review and Herald*, and our local papers containing complete reports of what we were doing were sent to Sister White, and how she could permit us to go right ahead and get into such awful trouble, when she had in her hands information from the Lord that we ought not to do it, is a mystery which some one will have to explain before we get through with this business."⁶⁶

V

35

Just how had the events of 1896-1906 affected Kellogg's relationship to Ellen White and her work? Late in 1905 he wrote, "I maintain the same position I always have. . . . I recognize the Lord's teachings in the Testimonies. I shall stand by that and no matter what she says or does I shall maintain this position. I am convinced that it is possible for her to err, and that there have been some errors, but I shall maintain that this fact does not weaken my faith nor change my attitude."⁶⁷

It is interesting that when Kellogg was finally disfellowshipped from the Battle Creek Tabernacle on November 10, 1907, there is recorded no public mention of pantheism — the visible part of the iceberg. Instead, after citing the doctor's nonattendance and nonsupport of the local church, Malcolm M. Campbell expressed the opinion that Kellogg was antagonistic "to the gifts now manifest in the church" and "allied with those who are attempting to overthrow the work for which this church existed." His charges were supported by two local elders of the congregation, veteran Adventist workers Augustin C. Bourdeau and George W. Amadon, who had held a seven-hour interview with Kellogg a few days earlier. The approximately 350 members present then unanimously voted to drop John Harvey Kellogg's name from the church rolls.⁶⁸ The iceberg had been met. The ship was terribly shaken, but it sailed onward.

Can we learn from this experience that which may help us to meet future bergs further ahead with perhaps less damage to the ship?

Note: The following symbols indicate the location of sources:

- EGW - Ellen G. White Estate, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Takoma Park, Maryland.
- MSU - Museum, Michigan State University.
- RBF - Race Betterment Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan. Much of this collection, but not all, has been subsequently transferred to the Michigan Historical Collections, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- LLU - Vernier Radcliffe Library, Loma Linda University.
- AU - History Department, Andrews University.

- 1 Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, book one (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association 1958), pp. 201-208.
- 2 E. G. White to John Harvey Kellogg, May 15, 1891 (K-10-1891) and May 17, 1894 (K-46-1894); Kellogg to E. G. White, March 25, 1894, EGW. In later years Kellogg used to recount his chagrin at hearing one of the White sons order a chicken for "Mother's" Sabbath dinner, when the butcher's wagon passed through the campgrounds on Friday during camp meeting. The doctor was not altogether consistent in this attitude, however, as during the trying days following James White's death, he advised Mrs. White to eat "a little fresh meat" as a health measure. See Kellogg to E. G. White, September 17, 1881, EGW.
- 3 Kellogg, Health principles, *General Conference Daily Bulletin*, p. 185 (March 1, 1897); General Conference proceedings, *The Daily Bulletin of the General Conference*, pp. 82-83 (February 26, 1899). Kellogg had a point. I remember vividly one now rather elderly Adventist telling how disillusioned she had been when, after hearing a General Conference leader give a strong health reform sermon, she had seen the same individual a few hours later in a local restaurant eating a large steak.
- 4 E. G. White to Kellogg, ca. January 1893 or 1894 (K-86a-1893), EGW.
- 5 Kellogg to E. G. White, June 28, 1898, EGW.
- 6 Kellogg to E. G. White, February 15, 1900, EGW.
- 7 Kellogg to William C. White, April 12, 1875, EGW.
- 8 Kellogg to E. G. White, October 18, 1896; April 11 and 14, 1897; April 14, 1898, EGW.
- 9 Kellogg to Stephen N. Haskell, March 30, 1903; June 18, 1905, MSU.
- 10 Kellogg to E. G. White, July 14, 1893; March 20, 1895, EGW.
- 11 Kellogg to W. C. White, August 31, 1884, and June 19, 1885. Kellogg to E. G. White, March 20, 1895; January 9, 1896; and November 5, 1901, EGW.
- 12 Kellogg to E. G. White, October 2, 1891; April 21, 1892; March 21, 1893, EGW.
- 13 Kellogg to E. G. White, December 16, 1896, EGW.
- 14 Kellogg to E. G. White, November 4, 1901, EGW.
- 15 Percy T. Magan to Roy A. Falconer, August 4, 1921, Magan papers LLU.
- 16 Kellogg to E. G. White, May 4, 1897, EGW. A determination of the actual goals and viewpoints of church leaders must await the opening of Adventist archives for historical research.

- 17 Kellogg, My first and last word (typescript dated December 16, 1907), RBF; Battle Creek Sanitarium minutes, April 8, 1905.
- 18 Battle Creek *Daily Journal*, July 1, 1898; January 8, 1903.
- 19 *Medical Missionary Conference Bulletin*, pp. 2-5 (March 9-14, 1899).
- 20 Battle Creek Sanitarium minutes, July 7, 1906; July 25, 1908; January 16, 1909.
- 21 *Medical Missionary Conference Bulletin*, p. 5 (March 9-14, 1899).
- 22 Stenographic report of a special committee meeting held in the office of Arthur G. Daniells in Battle Creek, October 30, 1902, RBF.
- 23 Battle Creek *Daily Journal*, January 8, 1903.
- 24 E. G. White, *Testimony for the Physicians and Helpers of the Sanitarium* (n. p., 1879), p. 31.
- 25 General Conference proceedings, *The General Conference Bulletin*, pp. 74-80 (April 6, 1903).
- 26 Carl Dicmann Anderson, The history and evolution of Seventh-day Adventist church organization (PH.D. thesis, American University 1960), pp. 225-226.
- 27 Kellogg to E. G. White, March 3, 1901, EGW; General Conference proceedings, *The General Conference Bulletin*, p. 66 (April 5, 1901); Organization of General Conference Committee, *The General Conference Bulletin*, p. 377 (April 22, 1901).
- 28 Kellogg to George I. Butler, October 7, 1902, MSU.
- 29 Kellogg to Butler, October 30, 1902, MSU.
- 30 Kellogg to E. G. White, December 13, 1902, EGW.
- 31 Daniells to C. C. Nicola, July 30, 1906, copy MSU.
- 32 Kellogg to Haskell, April 5, 1904, MSU. By late 1902 concern was being expressed by William W. Prescott and William A. Spicer concerning the pantheistic aspects of *The Living Temple*. That this played an important part in the Kellogg-Daniells break has long been recognized in Adventist circles. For a brief summary of this aspect, which lies outside the scope of my article, see LeRoy E. Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association 1971), pp. 349-356.
- 33 Daniells to L. C. Leake, February 18, 1906, copy MSU.
- 34 Numerous Kellogg associates have related accounts of the doctor's criticism of Daniells as a "meat-eater" to me. It evidently became something of an obsession with him.
- 35 Kellogg to Butler, May 2, 1904, MSU. See also Kellogg to E. G. White, December 1902, EGW. It would be most interesting to know the Daniells' version of this conversation. Unfortunately his correspondence files are not yet open to researchers.
- 36 Kellogg to Haskell, February 8, 1905. See also Kellogg to Butler, March 1, 1905, MSU.
- 37 Kellogg to Butler, October 30, 1902, MSU.
- 38 Because of the unavailability of Daniells' private papers, this account is unfortunately secondhand. Roderick S. Owen to Kellogg, June 16 and 21, 1907, MSU. Owen named "Elder Sanborn" as having heard this account directly from Daniells. Whether this was Isaac Sanborn or A. R. Sandborn is not clear, but circumstances would seem to indicate the latter, at that time vice-president of the East

Michigan Conference. It would be extremely interesting to know the "testimony" in question.

- 39 Kellogg to E. G. White, December 1902, EGW; Alonzo T. Jones to Daniells, January 26, 1906, copy MSU.
- 40 Kellogg to Haskell, April 5, 1904, MSU.
- 41 Kellogg to W. C. White, January 21, 1903, EGW.
- 42 Personal interview with Dr. William S. Sadler, September 22, 1960.
- 43 Magan to Spicer, August 6, 1928, Magan papers LLU.
- 44 Kellogg to W. C. White, January 21, 1903, EGW.
- 45 Kellogg to leading Seventh-day Adventist educators, January 20, 1903, Griggs papers AU.
- 46 Prescott, The reopening of Battle Creek College, *Review and Herald*, pp. 4-5 (August 27, 1903).
- 47 Kellogg to Butler, January 1, 1906, MSU.
- 48 Kellogg to E. G. White, March 8, 1899, EGW. It seems evident that the persons who received these duplicate "testimonies" did not use them with the caution Ellen White intended.
- 49 Kellogg to E. G. White, March 8, 1899, EGW.
- 50 Letter K-45-1895, EGW.
- 51 Letter K-138-1898, EGW.
- 52 Letter K-215-99, EGW.
- 53 Letter K-215b-99, EGW.
- 54 Letter K-33-00, EGW.
- 55 Letter K-41-00, EGW.
- 56 Letter K-74-00, EGW.
- 57 Letters K-180-01 and K-199-01, EGW.
- 58 The first mention of this instance appears to have been in 1899 (see E. G. White to Kellogg, October 5, 1903 [K-245a-03], EGW), but I have been unable to locate such a letter in the White Estate. It is possible that it was a handwritten one, of which no copy was made for the files. This sometimes happened.
- 59 Kellogg to Butler, January 1, 1906, MSU.
- 60 Letter K-239-03, EGW.
- 61 Kellogg to Butler, January 1, 1906, MSU. Such a resolution was passed, offered by W. C. White and seconded by Daniells. See International Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association minutes from *The General Conference Bulletin*, p. 290 (April 17, 1901) and p. 341 (April 19, 1901). The money was never raised, however, nor was the building erected.
- 62 E. G. White, *Testimonies for the Church*, volume eight (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association 1904), p. 134.
- 63 As examples see Letters K-43-95, K-45-95, and K-10-99, EGW.
- 64 Kellogg, The rebuilding of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, *Review and Herald*, pp. 21-23 (April 8, 1902); Magan to G. A. Roberts, October 6, 1936, Magan papers LLU.

- 65 E. G. White to Kellogg, August 6, 1903 (K-124-02), EGW; E. G. White, Our duty to leave Battle Creek, *Review and Herald*, p. 18 (April 14, 1903).
- 66 Kellogg to Butler, January 1, 1906, MSU. The material circulated in Battle Creek was quite likely copies of the Ellen G. White manuscript 76, 1903, dated February 20, 1902, two days after the sanitarium fire. A close reading of the manuscript does not indicate that Mrs. White had been shown at that time that the sanitarium should not be rebuilt in Battle Creek, but she does counsel a review of her earlier warnings against building too largely in this city.
- 67 Kellogg to Haskell, December 27, 1905, MSU. This statement appears to me to be about as accurate a description of Kellogg's views as it is possible to get at this time. He accepted the general teachings of Ellen White as containing divine truths, but he was not willing to accept all of her specific counsels and reproofs, excusing himself in this on the basis that in such cases she was acting on the basis of misinformation.
- 68 Minutes of an Adjourned Business Meeting of the S. D. Adventist Church, Battle Creek Tabernacle, November 10, 1907, document file 453a (copy), EGW; Malcolm N. Campbell to Daniells, November 11, 1907, copy EGW.